APPELLATE ADVOCACY FOR PROSECUTORS

November 16, 2018
Maricopa County Security Building
Phoenix, Arizona

JUDICIAL PERSPECTIVE ON APPELLATE ADVOCACY

Presented by:

JUDGE CATTANI
Arizona Court of Appeals

ROB ELLMAN
Managing Attorney, Ellman Law Group LLC

JUDGE HURWITZ
United States Circuit Judge, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

JOHN LOPEZ
Arizona Supreme Court Justice

Distributed by:

ARIZONA PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS' ADVISORY COUNCIL
1951 West Camelback Road, Suite 202
Phoenix, Arizona 85015

ELIZABETH ORTIZ
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Some Notes on

APPELLATE ADVOCACY

William C. Canby, Jr.
Senior Circuit Judge
U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit[1]

1. The court and process that you are dealing with when you appeal.

   a. Each judge now participates in well over 300 decisions per year. About 7 weeks before argument, we receive several cartons of briefs for the week's argument. Probably about 38 cases. At present, that means, at a possible 125 pages of briefs per argument, 4750 pages of briefs. We do not have the whole 7 weeks to read them (there is another calendar before then). Probably will have to be read in 6 or 7 days.

   b. Some cases will be selected by the panel for submission without argument. The degree to which that is done varies widely from panel to panel, but the simplest cases are most likely to be submitted.

   c. Cases will have been "weighted," which presumptively establishes whether they will be entitled to 10 minutes per side or 20 minutes per side in oral argument.

2. Taking an appeal.

   a. One of your most important decisions is whether to appeal at all. Here some ethical considerations may first appear. Many more clients want to appeal than should appeal. It may be most in your client's interest to convince him or her that it is time to get on with life.

   b. Considerations vary from civil to criminal cases; we have to face fact that criminal cases are far more likely to be appealed.

[1] The views expressed herein are personal to the author, and do not represent any official position or policy of the Court of Appeals.

c. Chances of success are not much better than 10% (probably less in criminal cases), and that is only reversal rate. Ultimate changes in outcome are rarer still.

3. Expediting the appeal.

In some circumstances, you may wish to make a motion to expedite the appeal.

a. When criminal sentence is very short.

b. Other comparable urgency.

4. Preparing the Excerpts of Record.

a. This step is more important than most lawyers believe. Do not throw in the kitchen sink, but include truly necessary items. The court has had cases where the only issue is the meaning of a clause in a contract or insurance policy, and the clause is not in the excerpts. The same is true of disputed instructions given or refused by the trial court.

5. Briefing.

a. This is the crux of the appeal. The first word heard from the lawyers is in the briefs. Well over 90% of the cases are won or lost in the briefing.

b. Read Fed. R. App. P. and Circuit Rules 28 for required contents.

c. Pick your issues. No trial is perfect, but you risk losing the court if you raise every conceivable issue. (Here again, the pressures are greater on counsel in criminal cases). Three or four main issues are plenty; one or two are wonderful. An appellate court will normally not entertain issues that were not raised in the trial court.

d. Remember what you are trying to do -- persuade. You must back off from the case and get an overview before you start writing. It begins with an intensive review of the record, but reflection must follow. In the overall scheme of things, why should this case be reversed (affirmed)?

e. Stating the issues. The court should be able to tell what the case is

about by reading the statement of issues; it won't do to state "whether the district court erred in granting summary judgment for the defendants."

It is better to state the issues neutrally, but some good advocates get a slight slant into the statement. But overkill is fatal: "Whether the district court abused its discretion in limiting the cross-examination of the defendant's expert in a grossly unfair manner resulting in a miscarriage of justice."

The matter-of-fact statement is preferable, and it need not be in question form. Issue (1): "The district court erred in ruling that the defendant was not in custody for Miranda purposes when he was interrogated while locked in the back of a police car."

f. Statement of the Case. Do tell what the case is about: the defendant was indicted, when he was tried, the result, etc. Relate the procedural matters that are in issue (i.e., "on Jan. 15, 1992, the trial court denied defendant's motion to suppress evidence"). Do not relate every single motion made and denied when those rulings are not in issue.

g. Statement of facts. It can be argued that this is the most important part of the brief. It is the first real picture of the case that the judge will receive. Some crucial points:

i. Tell the story of the case as a narrative. Do not recite the testimony witness-by-witness; this fractionated way to reveal a narrative is a necessary evil at trial, but it ought not to be transposed to your brief.

ii. Give record references for every statement of fact.

iii. Recognize that the appellate court will accept facts as found; you cannot recite the facts as you wish they would have been found. If a factual finding is in issue, you can recite the two views, so stating.

iv. Misstating the record will get you in more ultimate trouble with the court than any other misdeed.

v. Confine your facts to those necessary to make a sensible narrative and to illuminate the issues actually being contested on appeal. This means you will "throw away" many irrelevant facts.

h. Summary of argument. Not essential in a simple case, but advisable in the more complex ones. Remember it is just a summary; begin with the

ultimate proposition you want to establish, and give bare arguments. Two or three pages should be enough.

i. Argument. Here there are infinite variations, but some important principles endure:

i. Argue your own case; do not engage in an abstract discussion of law that is not applied to your case until the end of the brief.

ii. Start with your strongest proposition, followed by the strongest reasons why it is unassailable. Refute your opponent's points or contrary authority only after you have made your positive argument.

iii. Repeat for your next strongest point. If possible, your two or three major arguments should be independent, so that the court's rejection of one will not collapse a whole house of cards.

Know where you are going with these arguments; your brief should reflect an overall organization selected in advance.

iv. Be brief. Remember those 4750 pages the judge will be reading.

v. Avoid misleading quotations from the record or cases. It is advisable to cut quotations down by the use of ellipsis, but be extremely careful not to distort.

vi. Don't use string citations, and minimize footnotes. If a point is important enough to include, put it in the text, not in a footnote. If it is not important enough, omit it entirely. Footnotes can supplement the text, but they should never carry on a parallel argument.

vii. Avoid all but the most common abbreviations and acronyms. People normally talk about the "Santa Fe," not the "ATSFR." Do the same thing in your briefs. Don't assume that the judge is as familiar as you are with abbreviations used in a specialty. Environmental cases pose a special minefield here.

viii. Work on your prose. Use short, active sentences. The first four or five words of a sentence should tell you where that sentence is going: who is acting and what they did. Avoid inversions: "Because the evidence later indicated that the contract was unsigned, the judge ruled

the testimony inadmissible."

ix. When you are all finished, set the brief aside for a period, and then revise, clarify, simplify, shorten. Take the time to write a short, clear brief.

x. Appellees' briefs normally follow the issues in the order set by appellant, unless there is some good reason for deviating. The appellee may restate the facts and issues, or accept the statement of the appellant. Issues are usually restated; facts are often simply corrected in part. Otherwise, the principles of brief-writing are the same for appellees.

xi. Reply briefs should not rehash the opening brief. If there is nothing in the appellee's brief to respond to, you need not file a reply. A good reply, like a good rebuttal, should be truly brief and trenchant. The best reply briefs are a few pages long -- far from the 25 allowed.

An argument raised for the first time in the reply brief will normally be regarded as having been waived.

6. Oral argument.

a. Purpose, again, is to persuade, but you must truly highlight the case in a short time.

b. Narrow issues. Select two or three points (not whole issues set out in brief, but oral points) that you want to make in oral argument.

c. Have a plan of argument for the entire argument time, but do not become wedded to it. The court will almost certainly prevent you from presenting all of it, by its questions.

d. Begin with your most important point; there is usually a window of a minute or two when you can speak without interruption.

e. Like most appellate courts today, the Ninth Circuit will have read the briefs. Do not recite the facts; go directly to the heart of your case.

f. Respond directly to questions. This is where most oral advocates go wrong. Some important sub-points:

i. Remember that the questions indicate those matters that the court thinks are crucial. Do not be in a hurry to bring the argument back to your original plan, unless the question is truly out in left field.

ii. Listen to the question.

iii. Answer it first, directly. Then point out the necessary qualifications.

iv. Concede when you must. Your argument should have been sufficiently planned in advance so that you know what points you can concede. It is not good strategy to contest 100% of every case.

v. If you do not understand a question, say so. Sometimes the court asks questions that cannot be understood; it may rephrase them.

vi. If you don't know the answer, say so. If it may be important, offer to submit a supplemental brief if the court wishes one.

vii. Don't present a jury argument based on your version of the evidence, and avoid the type of rhetorical flourishes that you may like to use with juries. Appellate judges are a hardened lot.

viii. Know the record. One of the primary functions of oral argument, from the court's point of view, is to clarify questions in the record. It is not a satisfactory answer to a question about the record to say: "I don't know, I was not trial counsel."

ix. Don't fight the hypothetical question. The court knows that it is not based on the facts of your case; it is testing a theory. Answer it, and then, if you wish, point out the distinction between that situation and yours.

x. There is no perfect way to answer the occasional judge who pursues a line of questioning that is clearly irrelevant. One strategy is to say "I have two responses to that question." Then answer the question with your first response, and move back to a relevant point with your second. Another possibility: Answer the question and, without pausing, add: "There is one other highly important point I would like to make, if the court permits." If the questioner is truly out of line, other judges are likely to help and this gives them the opportunity. Be slow, however, to

conclude that a questioning judge is out of line; he or she may have a point even if you cannot see it.

g. Rebuttal. Rebuttal is usually mishandled by repeating points made in opening argument. The best rebuttal is short and points out an error in the appellee's argument. The most powerful rebuttal of all is to point out a misstatement of the record, or a misstatement of a controlling case. One or two minutes should be enough for all but the most complex cases. If you finish with your true rebuttal before your time is up, sit down; do not start going over your opening argument. Finish with a bang, not a whimper.

BYU Law Review

Volume 1992 | Issue 2 Article 2

5-1-1992

The Wrong Stuff

Alex Kozinski

The Wrong Stuff

Alex Kozinski[*]

A member of the *BYU Law Review* called a few months back and invited me to address you today. "Sure," I said, "I'll do it, but what can I possibly talk about that would be of interest to the students and faculty of BYU Law School?" "Why don't you juggle some porcupines or pull a piano out of a hat?" the law review member replied. "The truth is, we don't really care *what* you say; what we really want is the cover boy from *California Lawyer*."

Well, I have my pride. I don't want to be lumped in with the Tom Cruises and Kevin Costners of the world. I want to be loved for my intellect, not just my face. So I decided this is my opportunity to shed that go-go image by giving a speech on the dullest topic possible. *The Mating Habits of the Human Tapeworm* and *The Use and Abuse of "Thou" in the King James Version of the Bible* were among the possibilities I considered. The problem is that I don't know anything about those subjects. Instead, I decided to talk on a totally irrelevant topic that I know a little something about: How to Lose an Appeal.

Now, you might agree that I hit upon the ideal irrelevant topic, for how many lawyers would actually want to lose a case, particularly on appeal? But my law clerks pointed out that there might actually be such cases; history provides at least one well-documented example.

It happened right after Lyndon B. Johnson's Senate primary campaign in 1948. Now we're talking about the heyday of good ole boy politics: when a Texan so cherished his right to vote he exercised it as many times as possible, often in the same election. Anyway, some of LBJ's boys got caught with their fingers in the ballot box and a federal judge issued an

---

* Judge Kozinski sits on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. He presented this article as a lecture at Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark School of Law on January 21, 1992.

injunction keeping Johnson off the ballot in the general election. Naturally, LBJ was agin it, so he ordered his boys to figure out a way to get rid of that little ol' injunction before the election. The problem was that the Fifth Circuit was likely to sit on the case for a while, so even if they eventually held for LBJ it would turn out to be too late.

One of LBJ's boys, a guy named Abe Fortas, came up with a creative solution: throw the appeal. Why take chances on what some crotchety Fifth Circuit judge might do when you could be pretty sure of getting Justice Black to issue a stay? So old Abe wrote a stinker of a brief and presented it to a circuit judge Abe knew was predisposed to deny the stay. Sure enough, the plan worked and Johnson eventually became president—and appointed Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court.

Now, I know that every one of you out there has Supreme Court ambitions—don't deny it—so when that once-in-a-lifetime career opportunity knocks and you are required to lose an appeal, will you have what it takes to do the pooch? Not to worry; I'm here to tell you that you too can lose an appeal, no matter how good your case. But don't try to improvise; what I'm about to give you is the tried and true stuff, honed over years of bitter experience.

First, you want to tell the judges right up front that you have a rotten case. The best way to do this is to write a fat brief. So if the rules give you 50 pages, ask for 75, 90, 125—the more the better. Even if you don't get the extra pages, you will let the judges know you don't have an argument capable of being presented in a simple, direct, persuasive fashion. Keep in mind that simple arguments are winning arguments; convoluted arguments are sleeping pills on paper.

But don't just rely on the length of your brief to telegraph that you haven't got much of a case. No. Try to come up with something that will annoy the judges, make it difficult for them to read what you have written and make them mistrust whatever they *can* read. The possibilities are endless, but here are a few suggestions: Bind your brief so that it falls apart when the judge gets about half way through it. Or you could try a little trick recently used by a major law firm: Assemble your brief so that every other page reads up-side down. This is likely to induce motion sickness and it's always a fine idea to have the judge associate your argument with nausea. Also—this is a biggie—make sure your photocopier is low on toner or scratch the glass so it will put annoying lines on every

page. The judge won't even be able to decipher what you wrote, much less what you meant.

Best of all, cheat on the page limit. The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure not only limit the length of the briefs, but also indicate the type size to be used. This was pretty easy to police when there were two type sizes—pica and elite. But these days it is possible to create almost infinite gradations in size of type, the spacing between letters, the spacing between lines and the size of the margins.

Now if you don't read briefs for a living, one page of type looks pretty much like another, but you'd be surprised how sensitive you become to small variations in spacing or type size when you read 3,500 pages of briefs a month. Chiseling on the type size and such has two wonderful advantages: First, it lets you cram in more words, and when judges see a lot of words they immediately think: LOSER, LOSER. You might as well write it in big bold letters on the cover of your brief. But there is also a second advantage: It tells the judges that the lawyer is the type of sleazeball who is willing to cheat on a small procedural rule and therefore probably will lie about the record or forget to cite controlling authority.

So, if you do things just right, you will submit an enormous brief with narrow margins and tiny type, copied with a defective photocopier onto dingy pages, half of which are bound upside down with a fastener that gives way when the judge is trying to read the brief at 35,000 feet. You can lose your appeal before the judge even reads the first word.

But what if you think the judges might nevertheless read your brief and find a winning argument? You go to step two. Having followed step one, you already have a long brief, so you can conveniently bury your winning argument among nine or ten losers. I saw a wonderful example of this recently. It was the duel of the Paul Bunyons; who could fell more trees in pursuit of their cause? There were several appeals, motions and petitions for extraordinary writs—the whole shebang. What there was not was a winning argument, until a diligent law clerk searched through the rubble and found an issue that stood a good chance of winning.

Now, eager beaver law clerks like that don't come along in every case, but still there's a risk: What if a clerk—maybe even the judge—should happen to stumble onto your winning argument? To guard against this, winning arguments should not only be buried, they should also be written so as to be

totally unintelligible. Use convoluted sentences; leave out the verb, the subject, or both. Avoid periods like the plague. Be generous with legal jargon and use plenty of Latin. And don't forget the acronyms in bureaucratese. In a recent brief I ran across this little gem:

> LBE's complaint more specifically alleges that NRB failed to make an appropriate determination of RTP and TIP conformity to SIP.

Even if there was a winning argument buried in the midst of that gobbledygoop, it was DOA.

But let's face it, a good argument is hard to hold down. So what you want to do is salt your brief with plenty of distractions that will divert attention from the main issue. One really good way of doing this is to pick a fight with opposing counsel. Go ahead, call him a slime. Accuse him of lying through his teeth. The key thing is to let the court know that what's going on here is not really a dispute between the clients. No, that's there just to satisfy the case and controversy requirement. What is really going on here is a fight between the forces of truth, justice, purity and goodness—namely you—and Beelzebub, your opponent.

The reality, you see, is that most legal disputes are dreary dull, but everyone loves a good fight, particularly when the gloves come off. I often find myself chortling with delight when I read a passage such as this from a recent appellee's brief:

> With all due respect for my colleague, I have to tell this court that it's been told an incredible fairy tale, packed with lies and misrepresentations.

Of course, the other lawyer responded in kind. Pretty soon I found myself cheering for the lawyers and forgot all about the legal issues.

But let's say your opposing counsel is too smart to get into a hosing contest with you. No matter. You can always create a diversion by attacking the district judge. You might start out by suggesting that he must be on the take because he ruled against you. Or that he is senile or drunk with power, or just plain drunk. Chances are I'll be seeing that district judge soon at one of those secret conferences where judges go off together to gossip about the lawyers. I find that you can always get a real chuckle out of the district judge by copying the page where he is described as "a disgrace to the robe he wears" or as

"mean-spirited, vindictive, biased and lacking in judicial temperament" and sticking it under his nose right as he is sipping his hot soup. District judges love to laugh at themselves, and you can be sure that the next time you appear in his courtroom, the judge will find some way of thanking you for the moment of mirth you provided him.

But let's say you have such an excellent case that despite all of this, you are still likely to win, if only the judges read the relevant statutory language. Well that's easy: Don't quote the language; don't append it to your brief. In fact, don't even cite it. What you want to do is start out by discussing policy. Judges love policy; it gives us a sense of power. So instead of talking about what Congress did, talk about what it *should* have done. Then cite a bunch of floor statements, particularly from those Senators or Representatives who opposed the legislation. Finally, include large block quotes from the testimony of witnesses before a committee considering similar legislation but in a different Congress.

Block quotes, by the way, are a must; they take up a lot of space but nobody reads them. Whenever I see a block quote I figure the lawyer had to go to the bathroom and forgot to turn off the merge/store function on his computer. Let's face it, if the block quote really had something useful in it, the lawyer would have given me a pithy paraphrase.

Now, assuming you have taken my advice to heart and done everything just right—or rather just wrong—pretty soon you'll get confirmation of the fruit of your efforts. Sometime after the briefing is completed, you'll receive an order notifying you that your case has been submitted on the briefs. Once you get this notice, you can kick off your shoes, relax, and start working on your cert petition; an unpublished disposition flushing your case is practically in the mail.

But let's say the unthinkable happens and you get notice the case is scheduled for argument. Well, then you have to start sweating. In our court, cases get taken off the argument calendar only if all three judges agree. So getting an oral argument notice indicates that, despite your worst efforts, at least one of the judges thinks there might be a spark of life in your appeal. This means you'll have to move to phase three, and this time you can't take any chances.

Now most lawyers will say, "Look, you don't have to tell us how to make a bad argument: you just get up and stutter, or insult the judges, or ignore their questions." Well, those might

be good ways of getting you chewed out, but it won't necessarily kill your case. No, bad oral advocacy takes preparation and practice; like doggerel poetry, it also requires some imagination.

The first thing you must do at this stage is know the record like the back of your hand. There is a quaint notion out there that facts don't matter on appeal—that's where you argue about the law; facts are for sissies and trial courts. The truth is much different. The law doesn't matter a bit, *except* as it applies to a particular set of facts. So you will find that judges at oral argument often have a lot of questions about the record. Which makes sense. After all, we can read the cases just as well as you can. Often, one or another of the judges has written the key case, so what can the lawyer really contribute to the panel's understanding of it?

But each case is different insofar as the facts are concerned; where the lawyer can really help the judges—and his client—is by knowing the record and explaining how it dovetails with the various precedents. Familiarity with the record is probably the most important aspect of appellate advocacy.

Now this is all good and well, you will say, if you're trying to *win* on appeal, but why bother knowing the record if you're trying to lose? Well, it's simple: you have to know where the gold nuggets are hidden so that you can skillfully divert the judges' attention away from them. By the same token, if the judges start delving into an irrelevant portion of the record, you want to keep them talking about that.

Now a principle very few lawyers seem to grasp is that there are no perfect cases, or very few indeed. By the time a case gets up on appeal, there is usually some validity to each side's position, and there are some holes or flaws in even the best case. Nevertheless, this isn't soccer or hockey; there are no tie scores. In a competition between two imperfect cases, the winner winds up being the case that is second-worst.

A good way to improve your chances of losing is to overclaim the strength of your case. When it's your turn to speak, start off by explaining how miffed you are that this farce—this travesty of justice—has gone this far when it should have been clear to any dolt that your client's case is ironclad. Now the reason this is a good tactic is that it challenges the judges to get you to admit that there is just some little teensy-weensy weakness in your case. So if you overstate your case

enough, pretty soon one of the judges will take the bait and ask you a question about the very weakest part of your case. And, of course, that's precisely what you want the judges to be focusing on—the flaws in your case.

Now, having directed the judge's attention exactly where you want it, you have to press your advantage—or rather your disadvantage—by seeing if you can turn the judge into an advocate for the other side. After all, you know darn well that after oral argument the judges go off to a little room and decide your case. What better way to assure a loss than to get one of the judges to become an advocate for your opponent?

So how do you turn that flickering spark of interest into a firestorm that will reduce your argument to ashes? What I have found works really well under such circumstances is this: once the judge starts to ask a question, raise your hand in a peremptory fashion and say, "Excuse me, your honor, but I have just a few more sentences to complete my summation and I'll be happy to answer your questions." This will give the judge a chance to dwell on the question, roll it around in his mind and brood about it. If you're clever you never *will* get back to the judge's question. Let the judge stew while you keep droning on about how airtight your case is and how silly it is to even be arguing about it.

After a while the judges will catch on that you plan to use up your time by yakking rather than answering questions and they will start getting more insistent. When you feel you've got them good and lathered, move into the next phase: stonewalling. What you want to avoid at all costs is giving a short, direct answer to the question. Instead, tease the judge, equivocate, make him rephrase the question. The point is to get the judge really committed to the question so that the lack of a good answer will take on monstrous significance. A good way to start is by ridiculing the question: "I was afraid the court would get sidetracked down a blind alley by this red herring." Mixing metaphors, by the way, is always a good idea; it makes it look like you're spinning your wheels after you've missed the boat because you went off on a wild goose chase.

An alternative to stonewalling—and one of my personal favorites—is cutting off a judge's question. Doing this gives you several important advantages. First, it's rude, and if you're out to lose your case, there is really no substitute for offending the guy who's about to decide your case. Beyond that, cutting off the judge mid-question sends an important message: Look here

your honor, you think you're so clever, but *I* know exactly what is going on inside that pointed little head of yours. Then again, cutting the judge off gives you an opportunity to answer the wrong question. When I pointed this out to a lawyer one time, he told me, "Well, if that's not the question you were asking, it *should* be." And finally, cutting in with an answer while the judge is still phrasing the question gives you an opportunity to answer without thinking—always a good idea if you want to come up with something really stupid.

The next oral argument ploy involves the record. As I said before, it's important for you to know the record just so you can tell when the judge is getting anywhere near that winning argument. But there is a big difference between knowing the record and sharing your knowledge with the judge. It helps to keep your understanding of the record a big secret; this will give the judge and his clerks a chance to go chasing through the fourteen boxes of documents looking for that needle in the haystack. Here is a good example of how best to handle inquiries about the record if the judge gets too insistent:

> JUDGE (exasperated): Look counsel, you claim there is no disputed issue of fact on this point, but isn't it true that the affidavit of Joe Smith, submitted by opposing counsel, directly contradicts your client's affidavit?
>
> LAWYER: Well, your honor, I'm not really sure.
>
> JUDGE: Let's not guess. The affidavit appears at page 635 of the Excerpts of Record. Why don't we read it together and you can explain to me what it says.
>
> LAWYER: Your honor, I don't have the Excerpts.
>
> JUDGE: That's OK, counsel, you can go over to your briefcase and bring it to the lectern. I'll wait.
>
> LAWYER: Well, what I mean, your honor, is I didn't bring the Excerpts with me to court.
>
> JUDGE: I see; well, what did you think we were going to do here today, have coffee and donuts and talk about the weather?
>
> LAWYER: To be truthful, I thought we were going to talk about the law. I wasn't counsel in the district court so I'm not really all that familiar with the record, but if you say the affidavit is in there, how can I deny it?
>
> JUDGE: Well, let's talk about the law then. Isn't it the law that you can't get summary judgment if there is a disputed

issue of fact? And the affidavit seems to establish a disputed issue of fact.

LAWYER: But that's true only if you believe the affidavit. I can tell you for a fact it's a lie. In any event it's hearsay since it describes out of court conduct, and it's not the best evidence.

By this time you can probably see steam coming out of the judge's ears, which is a good time to move onto your next tactic: start making a jury argument. The truth is that oral argument can be tiring and the judges need a little comic relief once in a while. Few things are quite as funny as hearing an appeal to passion during an appellate argument. But if you try it, remember that a jury argument is no good at all unless you have the client (and his wife) sitting in the front row nodding. Of course, a lot of clients are not very sympathetic looking, which is all right because appellate judges have no way of knowing what your client really looks like. So you could just pay some sympathetic looking homeless person twenty bucks to sit in the front row and nod.

When a lawyer resorts to a jury argument on appeal, you can just see the judges sit back and give a big sigh of relief. We understand that you have to say all these things to keep your client happy, but we also understand that you know, and we know, and you know we know, that your case doesn't amount to a hill of beans, so we can go back there in the conference room and flush it with an unpublished disposition.

* * * *

Well, I could go on and on with this topic, but it seems to me that if you win your case after all the pointers I've given you, you ought to give up practicing law and start playing the lottery. But for most of you it *will* work. So when the call comes and you get ready to follow in the footsteps of Abe Fortas, you too can prove you have The Wrong Stuff.